

1 JAMES ATTRIDGE [SBN NO. 124003]  
Business Trial Lawyer  
2 The Fox Plaza, Suite 1204  
1390 Market Street  
3 San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 552-3088  
4  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
5 ONEBEACON INSURANCE COMPANY  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

11 ONEBEACON INSURANCE COMPANY,

12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 HAAS INDUSTRIES, INC.,

15 Defendant(s).  
16

Case No: C-07-3540 BZ (MEJ)

**MOTION TO STRIKE EVIDENCE  
PROFFERED BY DEFENDANT IN  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Date: April 2, 2008  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: Courtroom G

17  
18 Plaintiff and moving party hereby moves to strike paragraph 4 and Exhibit B of the  
19 Declaration of Carmen Holster in opposition to this motion. This motion is made on alternative  
20 grounds: (1) the Exhibit is a document which has never previously been disclosed and no  
21 justification for non-disclosure has been made Paradigm Sales v. Weber Marketing Systems, 880  
22 F.Supp. 1247, 1250 (N.D. Ind. 1995) and (2) there is insufficient foundation laid for the  
23 document in that it cannot be established that it was ever sent to Omneon. . It is therefore  
24 inadmissible. Orr v. Bank of America, NT&SA, 285 F.3d 764, 773 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002)

25 Ms. Holster states her belief that Exhibit B was sent to all customers in January 2005, but  
26 that no copy was in her Omneon file and that she only came across it on March 11, 2008. She  
27 states that she believes the letter was sent to Omneon "based on a review of our accounting file"  
28 without attaching the file or bothering to explain how that file could be so illuminating.

1 Accordingly no sufficient foundation has been established for the document.

2 Moreover, in paragraph 3 of her declaration, she states that Omneon never asked for a  
3 copy of Haas' tariff, which she identifies as Exhibit A. Haas' opposition on page 5 argues that  
4 the absence of any tariff reference to the valuation charged assessed in lieu of the limitation is a  
5 "red herring" because Omneon did not ask for it.

6 In light of her admission that she only found Exhibit B by serendipity, it does not  
7 logically follow that Exhibit B would have been sent to Omneon anyway.

8  
9 Respectfully submitted

10 DATED: March 19, 2008

JAMES ATTRIDGE

11

12

13

By: /s/ James Attridge

14

JAMES ATTRIDGE

Attorney for Plaintiff

ONEBEACON INSURANCE COMPANY

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28